

DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar #139669
City Attorney
KRISTEN A. JENSEN, State Bar #130196
THOMAS S. LAKRITZ, State Bar #161234
Deputy City Attorneys
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 554-6547
Facsimile: (415) 554-4747
E-Mail: tom.lakritz@sfgov.org

Attorneys for Defendant
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

METRO FUEL LLC, a Delaware limited
liability company,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, a municipal
corporation, COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO, a subdivision of the State
of California, CITY AND COUNTY OF
SAN FRANCISCO, a chartered California
city and county and DOE 1 through DOE
10,

Defendants.

Case No. C07-6067 JSW

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
DEFENDANT CITY AND COUNTY OF
SAN FRANCISCO'S MOTION FOR
JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS
Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(c)**

Defendant City and County of San Francisco's Motion for Judgment on Pleadings came on regular hearing before the Court on June 13, 2008. Paul Fisher appeared on behalf of Plaintiff Metro Fuel LLC ("Metro Fuel"). Deputy City Attorney Thomas S. Lakritz appeared on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco ("the City").

After considering the papers submitted by the parties and the arguments of counsel, the Court grants the City's motion.

1 Metro Fuel's claim that San Francisco Planning Code, Article 6 violates the First Amendment
2 fails, because the City may ban commercial advertising when the ban is based on esthetics and
3 pedestrian and driver safety. *See Metromedia v. City of San Diego*, 453 U.S. 490 (1981).

4 Metro Fuel's claim that the inventory requirements of San Francisco Planning Code section
5 604.2 violate the Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination fails, because as a business
6 organization Metro Fuel does not enjoy the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination
7 encompassed by the 5th Amendment. *See California Bankers Ass'n v. Shultz*, 416 U.S. 21, 55 (1974);
8 *United States v. White*, 322 U.S. 694, 698 (1944).

9 Metro Fuel's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim is time barred. Metro Fuel did not initiate this lawsuit by
10 March 5, 2003, which is one year after the adoption of Proposition G. Nor did Metro Fuel allege any
11 acts that occurred since November 30, 2005, that might give rise to a cause of action against the City.
12 Furthermore, San Francisco's ban on new general advertising signs is rationally related to a legitimate
13 government interest. *See Posadas de Puerto Rico Associates v. Tourism Company of Puerto Rico*,
14 478 U.S. 328, 344 fn.9 (1986). Finally, Metro Fuel's procedural due process claim fails, because
15 Metro Fuel does not have a vested right in erecting any new general advertising signs in San
16 Francisco. *See Outdoor Media Group, Inc. v. City of Beaumont*, 506 F.3d 895, 902-903 (9th Cir.
17 2007).

18
19 Dated:

20
21

HONORABLE JEFFREY S. WHITE
22 Judge of the U.S. District Court
23
24
25
26
27
28